

Reply to a comment on the proposed precedence of *Aphonopelma* Pocock, 1901 (Arachnida, Araneae) over *Rhechostica* Simon, 1892
(Case 2662; see BZN 46: 165–166, 189–190; 47: 126–127)

Herbert W. Levi

Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.

Otto Kraus

Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, Universität Hamburg, Martin-Luther-King-Platz 3, D-2000 Hamburg 13, Fed. Rep. Germany

In his comment on this case Raven (BZN 47: 126–127) refers to the listing of *Rhechostica* in catalogues. However, the mentioning of names in catalogues, lists and nomenclators does not constitute usage for the purposes of the Principle of Priority (see Article 79c(2,i) of the Code).

Raven's discussion of the usage of *Eurypelma* Koch, 1850 is not relevant to the proposed precedence of *Aphonopelma* over *Rhechostica*. As we pointed out before (BZN 46: 165, para. 4), *Rhechostica* had remained unused for 93 years until resurrected by Raven (1985). One of us (H.W.L.) has found that amongst North American arachnologists who have talked or written about this case all except one (R.C. West; see BZN 46: 190) support the rejection of *Rhechostica*.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Ixodes angustus* Neumann, 1899 and *I. woodi* Bishopp, 1911 (Arachnida, Acari) by replacement of the holotype of *I. angustus*
(Case 2696; see BZN 46: 167–169)

G.B. White (Editor, *Medical & Veterinary Entomology*)

c/o The Royal Entomological Society, London SW7 5HU, U.K.

Non-systematists become habituated to the name used for any species of applied importance. The knowledge of such species becomes embodied in textbooks and reports using the familiar name, so that any taxonomic reinterpretation of the species takes a while to become widely understood and accepted. Name changes for familiar species are therefore unpopular, but may be taxonomically necessary for biological reasons. Changes in usage of important species names are unjustifiable simply to fulfil the Principle of Priority and other rules of the Code.

In the field of medical and veterinary entomology there are conspicuous precedents for replacement of type specimens in order to conserve the accepted meaning of a species name. For example, the case of the mosquito *Aedes aegypti* (Linnaeus, 1762) involving designation of a neotype as proposed by Mattingly et al. (BZN 19: 208–219) was settled by Opinion 711 (1964). The case of *Culex pipiens* Linnaeus, 1758 involved designation of a neotype by Harbach et al. (1985) without recourse to the Commission. Both cases involved keeping the familiar name for a medically important species, despite conflicting evidence concerning the biological identity of original type specimens.

The proposed conservation of the names *Ixodes angustus* Neumann, 1899 and *I. woodi* Bishopp, 1911, involving replacement of the holotype of *I. angustus* by the neotype proposed by Robbins & Keirans in keeping with accustomed usage, should be supported as the most expedient solution to the taxonomic problem raised by their observation that the holotypes of these nominally different species appear to be conspecific, whereas these two names have always been used unambiguously for two biologically distinct tick species of some medico-veterinary importance.

Additional reference

Harbach, R.E., Dahl, C. & White, G.B. 1985. *Culex* (*Culex*) *pipiens* Linnaeus (Diptera: Culicidae): concepts, type designations, and description. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, 87: 1-24.

Comments on the conservation of the spelling of the specific name of *Macrocheles robustulus* (Berlese, 1904) (Arachnida, Acarina)

(Case 2725; see BZN 47: 24-26)

The proposed ruling that the accepted spelling of the specific name of the mite *Macrocheles robustulus* (Berlese, 1904) be deemed correct although it was first published as '*rubustulus*' has been supported in letters received from 31 persons: Richard C. Axtell (*North Carolina, U.S.A.*); Gerald T. Baker (*Mississippi, U.S.A.*); A.K. Datta (*Assam, India*); R.M. Emberson (*Canterbury, New Zealand*); G.P. Hall (*Western Australia*); Robert D. Hall (*Missouri, U.S.A.*); W. Hirschmann (*Nürnberg, Fed. Rep. Germany*); T.M. Ho (*Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia*); E. Holm (*New South Wales, Australia*); Robert W. Husband (*Michigan, U.S.A.*); K.H. Hyatt (*Wales, U.K.*); H. Koehler (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*); G.W. Krantz (*Oregon, U.S.A.*); E.E. Lindquist (*Ontario, Canada*); M. Luxton (*Liverpool, England*); W. Niedbala (*Poznan, Poland*); Roy A. Norton (*New York, U.S.A.*); James H. Oliver, Jr. (*Georgia, U.S.A.*); J.C. Otto (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*); F. Pegazzano (*Firenze, Italy*); G.W. Ramsay (*Auckland, New Zealand*); M.K.P. Smith Meyer (*Pretoria, South Africa*); R.V. Southcott (*South Australia*); M. Spear (*Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*); Victor F. Stanis (*Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*); G. Takaku (*Sapporo, Japan*); P.D. Theron (*Potchefstroom, South Africa*); M.B. Usher (*York, England*); M.M.H. Wallace (*Canberra, Australia*); D.E. Walker (*Florida, U.S.A.*); F.E. Wendt (*Bremen, Fed. Rep. Germany*).

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Bathynomus* A. Milne Edwards, 1879 (Crustacea, Isopoda)

(Case 2721; see BZN 47: 27-29)

Jacques Forest

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 61 rue de Buffon, 75231 Paris, France

Je me permets d'apporter un appui total à la proposition présentée par Martin & Kuck, visant à conserver le nom de *Bathynomus*, établi pour un genre d'Isopode par A. Milne Edwards en 1879 et menacé par une mise en synonymie récente avec le genre fossile *Palaega* Woodward, 1870.